



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,014	03/15/2004	Jianfang Zhang	2584-3	6809
23117	7590	08/04/2006	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203			SINGH, PREM C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1764	

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/800,014

Applicant(s)

ZHANG ET AL.

Examiner

Prem C. Singhi

Art Unit

1764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-7 in the reply filed on 07/14/2006 is acknowledged.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "7" and "26" have both been used to designate "catalyst buffer tank". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

"Catalyst buffer tank" (26) can not be identified.

Art Unit: 1764

In figure 3, the equipment where streams (24) and (25) are entering, do not have numbers to identify them.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 1764

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhattacharyya et al (US Patent 7,029,571).

Claim 1.

Bhattacharyya discloses, "A multistage selective catalytic cracking process comprising the steps of: (i) contacting preheated feed with a mixed catalyst in a first riser reactor under catalytic cracking conditions to obtain first cracked hydrocarbon products; (ii) separating the cracked hydrocarbon products; (iii) cracking the second fraction from the first riser reactor to obtain second cracked hydrocarbon products; (iv) separating the catalytically cracked products from the second riser reactor along with cracked products from the first riser reactor in a main fractionating column to yield cracked products comprising dry gas, LPG, gasoline, middle distillates, heavy cycle oil, and slurry oil; (v) recycling the entire heavy cycle oil into the second riser reactor; (vi) optionally, recycling the fraction of unconverted hydrocarbons obtained in step (v) in riser reactor(s)." (Column 4, lines 4-56). "It is pertinent to note that in practice, riser reactors of any desired number may be functionally attached downstream of the second riser reactor." (Column 7, lines 55-57). The residence time in the riser reactors is 1-8 second (Column 8, lines 40-41). "The spent catalyst is then passed through a common or separate stripping section. Stripped catalyst is then passed to a common dense or

Art Unit: 1764

turbulent fluidized bed regenerator. A part of the regenerated catalyst is directly circulated to the second riser reactor.” (Column 9, lines 18-28). Bhattacharyya further discloses, “Gas oil is cracked in the first riser in the presence of aforesaid catalyst mixture. The heavy naphtha product from the first riser and/or virgin straight run naphtha are cracked in the second riser in the presence of catalyst mixture to produce high octane gasoline together with C₃ and C₄ olefins.” (Column 2, lines 60-65).

Although Bhattacharyya uses two riser reactors in the embodiment, the invention does suggest using third riser reactor, and therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bhattacharyya invention and recycle a part of the gasoline/middle distillate fraction from the fractionating column to the third riser reactor to increase the production of high octane gasoline and C₃ and C₄ olefins.

Claims 2 and 3.

Bhattacharyya uses cracking catalysts A, B, C, D, and E (Table 7, column 14; Table 10, column 16). Bhattacharyya also discloses, “Both the first and second stage risers are charged with the same catalyst.” (Column 12, lines 13-14). Although Bhattacharyya does not specifically mention using different catalysts in the three risers, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bhattacharyya invention and use different catalysts in the three risers because all the mentioned cracking catalysts (A through E) are expected to give equivalent performance in the cracking operation and make the process more flexible.

Art Unit: 1764

Claim 4.

As mentioned under claims 2 and 3, Bhattacharyya uses the same catalyst in all the three risers. Also Bhattacharyya discloses, " The basic objective of this invention is to maximize the yield of light olefins." (Column 3, lines 15-17). Clearly, Bhattacharyya suggests using different catalysts for different end products.

Claims 5-7.

Bhattacharyya discloses all the steps including, contacting the hot regenerated catalyst with the incoming feed in the first riser reactor, separating the cracked products, recycling the separated heavy product to the second riser reactor, stripping the catalyst, regenerating, and recycling to the riser reactor (Column 6, lines 46-67; column 7, lines 1-45). Bhattacharyya also discloses, as mentioned under claim 1, separating cracked gases, LPG, and gasoline from the distillation column.

Although Bhattacharyya mentions using only two risers, the invention does suggest using the third riser and as discussed under claim 1, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bhattacharyya invention and recycle a part of the cracked gases including LPG, gasoline, and middle distillate fraction from the fractionating column to the third riser reactor to increase the production of high octane gasoline and C₃ and C₄ olefins.

Although Bhattacharyya does not specifically mention first, second, and third catalyst regeneration and recycle system, figure 2 of the invention shows two risers (1 and 2) (and suggests three risers), a regenerator (7), and recycle loops (9, 2) and (8, 19, 1), thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 1764

was made to modify Bhattacharyya invention and claim catalyst regeneration and recycle systems for proper control of the entire cracking process.

Although Bhattacharyya does not specifically mention the third riser as descending third riser, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bhattacharyya invention and use a descending riser reactor to simplify the design of the reactor and make the process more flexible. Since a riser reactor can be ascending or descending, it is expected that the descending reactor will also be as effective as the ascending reactors (risers 1 and 2).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Herbst et al, US Patent 4,830,728.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prem C. Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-6381. The examiner can normally be reached on MF 6:30 AM-3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on 571-272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1764

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ps/072606

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized, cursive script that appears to read "Zam".